enabled to do so, the villages would improve and the country as a whole would be so much the better for it in course of time.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. S. SHAMANNA) explained that the points referred to in the course of the discussions were three, *viz.*, efficiency, economy and scope for employment of unemployed men. They had all been taken into consideration before the order under reference was passed. The question of efficiency was one that had best be left to the discretion of Government as they were as keen about it as any one else. There was also no doubt that grant of extensions in all deserving cases would result in reduced expenditure under pensions and salaries. As regards scope for employment of more men, that question remained affected by the grant of extensions as the total number employed remained the same and scope for employment would increase only if more appointments were created.

MR. H. K. MADIAH stated that economy should not be the sole consideration. There should be better opportunities for educated young men to enter Government service. That would be possible only if officials were retired soon after they attained 55 years of age.

MR. K. T. BHASHYAM AIYANGAR was also of opinion that all superannuated men should promptly be retired. The officials would have already served for a long period of 30 years and would very much prefer a change of life, engaging themselves in the cause of the country, as non-officials.

MR. TUDKI RAMANNA GOWDA also supported the representation.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) observed that the order had been passed only as a temporary measure.

THE DEWAN added that the order would be withdrawn if it was found that, as a consequence of it, efficiency of the services had suffered.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for the day, to meet again at 12 of the clock the next day.

SECOND DAY.

Friday, 14th June 1935.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock *Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. Matthan, First Member of Council, presiding.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—(*contd.*)

Drafting of Officers to the Amildari Service.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggadadevankote Taluk); GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—10. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) How many officers were drafted from the Education Department as Deputy Amildars and Amildars since the last Dasara Session ?

(*b*) What are the particulars of (i) caste, (ii) qualification, (iii) service, and (iv) age of such officers ?

(*c*) Was it not stated during the last Dasara Session that no one from the Education Department would be included in the Amildari list ?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI).—

A. (*a*) Two. One as Amildar and another as Deputy Amildar.

(*b*)—

	Amildar.	*Deputy Amildar.*
(i) Caste	... Mahomedan	... Darzi
(ii) Qualification	... B.A., B.T.	... B.Sc.
(iii) Service	... 8 years	... 8 years and 8 months
(iv) Age	... 37	... 29

(*c*) Yes. The names of the two officers referred to above had been included in the list prior to the issue of instructions contained in Government Order No. R. 6308-67—L.R. 353-33-5, dated 26th June 1934.

MR. H. K. MADIAH.—When were the names of the officers referred to included in the Amildari list?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Notice.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—After the issue of the Government Order referred to in the answer to (*c*), was not the list revised in accordance with the new principle enunciated in the order?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Yes.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—At the time of revision, why were their names not omitted?

THE SECOND MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina* S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI).—Government did not want to give retrospective effect to that order.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN).—Besides, these officials had received special training.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—One of these two officers is a Deputy Amildar belonging to the tailor community. Are not the Government aware that he was once an Assistant Inspector in the Education Department and that there were many complaints against him?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—I cannot say.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—What are the departments in which he served previously for a period of 8 years and 8 months?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Notice.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—It is said that the qualification of one of the Amildars is B.A., B.T. What is the purpose served by selecting a B.T. for work in the Revenue Department? Would he not have done better in the Education Department?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—We cannot say that he will not do well in the Revenue Department merely because he is a B.T.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—At the time of selection itself had the officer passed the B.T. Examination?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Notice.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—Are there any more in the Education Department whose names had been included in the list prior to the issue of the Government Order but who are not yet appointed as Amildars?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—Notice.

MR. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA.—If there are any such men, will the Government appoint them also as Amildars?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—In revising the list next, Government propose to adopt the new principle.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY.—If there are men in the Education Department having the necessary training and fit to be drafted to the Revenue Department, why do the Government intend to stop drafting them as heretofore?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—This is not the time to discuss the entire policy.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH.—If there are men in other departments also who have already received training, will they also be drafted as Amildars and Deputy Amildars?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—If their names are already included in the list and if they have the requisite training, I do not see any objection why they should not be taken when their turn comes.

MR. N. G. SANJEEVIAH.—There is one such person in the Judicial Department. Why was his name omitted?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—I am not aware if there are such cases at all. If the conditions are similar, they will be treated similarly.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Among those already trained, were there not men belonging to other communities?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—There might have been.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA.—Then, why have they not been drafted?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—But the appointments have been made according to a certain order.

MR. B. L. BYANNA.—How many years ago did the officers referred to in the question receive training?

MR. K. MATTHAN—Notice.

MR. B. L. BYANNA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that in the Judicial Department there are men who were trained 5 or 6 years ago but who have not been appointed as Amildars ?

MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI.—No.

Promotions to the grades of Assistant Commissioners, Amildars and Deputy Amildars.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk); S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA (Krishnarajpet Taluk); C. DASAPPA (Heggadadevankote Taluk); GURUBASAPPA (Chamarajanagar Taluk); MIR RAZA ALI (Minorities); B. S. PUTTASWAMY (Nanjangud Taluk); H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA (T.-Narsipur Taluk); H. HONNAYYA and M. L. LINGANNA (Mandya Taluk); PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA (Yelandur Jahgir); K. KEMPE GOWDA (Mandya Municipality); A. THAMMAYYA (Minorities); B. SIDDALINGA SETTY (Special Interests) and S. C. MALLIAH (Maddur Taluk).—

Q.—11. Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) How many Amildars were promoted to the grade of Assistant Commissioners from 1st January 1934 up-to-date ?

(*b*) What are the particulars of their service, caste, qualification and special merit ?

(*c*) How many were taken to the grade of Deputy Amildars and Amildars from other departments and how many were promoted from the lower ranks of the Revenue Department ?

(*d*) Particulars of caste, service, qualification of the persons in clause (*c*) and the departments in which they were serving may be kindly furnished.

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASVAMI).—*A.*—(*a*) and (*b*) A statement is placed on the table. (*Vide* Appendix.)

(*c*) Eighteen officials from other departments were taken to the grade of Deputy Amildars and Amildars and 9 were promoted as such from the lower ranks of the Revenue Department.

(*d*) A statement is placed on the table. (*Vide* Appendix.)

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—Why is it that no information is given in the statement furnished in answer to question (*d*) with regard to officials promoted from the Revenue Department ?

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) We shall furnish the required information later.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA.—The list furnished in answer to (*d*) includes the name of one Mr. S. Hiriannaiya whose qualification is stated to be English Lower Secondary Is that a sufficient qualification to justify promotion to Amildari ?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—He has put in 22 years of service and is considered fit for promotion. Educational qualification alone does not form the criterion in the case of men who have already put in long service.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMY.—With regard to Amildars who have been promoted as Assistant Commissioners, may I know whether those promotions are made according to an approved list or on any other principle ?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—I do not think that is a question on which Government are prepared to give any information.

MR. C. N. NARASINGA RAO.—With reference to answer to (*c*), would it not be advisable to give preference to men who are already in the Revenue Department ?

MR. K. MATTHAN.—That is a question of policy which need not be discussed in the course of supplementary questions and answers.

Delay in the Grant of a Gun License.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH (Malvalli Taluk); SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH (Mysore Taluk); T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA (Nagamangala Taluk);